REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed April 12, 2010. Claims 1-6 and 8-32 stand rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 20, 31, and 32 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not add new matter because support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraphs 44, 57, 58, 63, and 117 of the specification as originally filed. No claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-6 and 8-32 are presented for examination. Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Summary of Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting an Examiner Interview on June 22, 2010. In the Examiner Interview, the claims were discussed in light of the §103 rejection with regard to reference U.S. Patent No. 5,835,722 to Bradshaw, U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618 to Shannon, and U.S. Patent No. 6,507,846 to Consens. In particular, possible clarifying amendments were discussed. No agreement on patentability was reached.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15, 20-21, 24-26 and 31-32

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15, 20-21, 24-26 and 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,722, hereinafter "Bradshaw"), in view of Shannon (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618, hereinafter "Shannon") and further in view of Consens (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,846, hereinafter Consens).

Bradshaw is directed to preventing future access to vulgar Internet sites and future creation of vulgar documents. Specifically, Bradshaw describes blocking attempts to access and transmit vulgar and pornographic material.

Shannon describes a client that sends a packet, carrying a request for a web page, to a server. A network device that acts as a gateway between the client and the server receives the packet from the client before it is delivered to the server. The network device determines whether the client is trying to access a restricted web page by comparing the destination URL and the destination IP address in the packet against a database within the network device containing a list of URLs and IP addresses for restricted web pages.

Consens discloses a method of indexing data sources to permit efficient relational queries on the data sources. An index is created from the data sources. The index is then used by an application program to efficiently perform a query (search) on the data sources. The index has several data structures, including a data structure that relates to the position of the token data and a data structure that is based on a lexicographic ordering of tokens.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part searching, locally, text contained in a plurality of documents stored on a plurality of data storage media of the client device for an indication that at least a portion of the pre-selected data stored on the server is contained in the text of the plurality of documents, the indication being detected using the positional information in the abstract data structure identifying the position in the pre-selected data for each data element, the positional information in the abstract data structure being unrelated to the text searched.

Applicants' Specification describes some embodiments of the invention as follows. In one embodiment of the invention, a Policy Management System (PMS) in a server creates an abstract data structure from data elements of data to be protected and includes positional information for each the data element in the abstract data structure (Specification, paragraphs 44

and 117). Once the abstract data structure is created, it is sent from the PMS to multiple client

devices (Specification, paragraphs 57 and 58). Each client device has a plurality of documents

which are searched for the data elements whose positional information is in the abstract data

structure (Specification, paragraphs 57, 63 and 117). Therefore, when the abstract data structure

is created on the server, the server has no knowledge of the client devices to which the abstract

data structure will be sent nor any knowledge of the documents stored on those client devices.

Hence, the positional information in the abstract data structure created by the server is based on

the data elements of the data to be protected, and has no relation to stored documents which will

be searched on a client device.

The Examiner acknowledges that Bradshaw does not teach or suggest an abstract data

structure containing positional information identifying the position in the pre-selected data for

each data element. Because Bradshaw does not teach or suggest positional information in the

abstract data structure, Bradshaw cannot teach or suggest searching, locally, text contained in a

plurality of documents stored on a plurality of data storage media of the client device for an

indication that at least a portion of the pre-selected data stored on the server is contained in the

text of the plurality of documents, the indication being detected using the positional information

in the abstract data structure identifying the position in the pre-selected data for each data

element, the positional information in the abstract data structure being unrelated to the text

searched as claimed.

Moreover, the Examiner acknowledges that Shannon does not teach or suggest an

abstract data structure containing positional information identifying the position in the pre-

selected data for each data element. Because Shannon does not teach or suggest positional

information in the abstract data structure, Shannon cannot teach or suggest searching, locally,

text contained in a plurality of documents stored on a plurality of data storage media of the client

device for an indication that at least a portion of the pre-selected data stored on the server is contained in the text of the plurality of documents, the indication being detected using the positional information in the abstract data structure identifying the position in the pre-selected data for each data element, the positional information in the abstract data structure being unrelated to the text searched as claimed.

Consens fails to teach or suggest the elements which are missing from Bradshaw and Shannon. Consens' data structure related to the position of the token data is created from the data sources to be searched, and is not derived from data elements of the preselected data that is being **searched for** as required by claim 1. Because Consen's data structure is related to the data being searched, it is NOT an equivalent of the claimed abstract data structure. Thus, Consens cannot teach or suggest searching, locally, text contained in a plurality of documents stored on a plurality of data storage media of the client device for an indication that at least a portion of the pre-selected data stored on the server is contained in the text of the plurality of documents, the indication being detected using the positional information in the abstract data structure identifying the position in the pre-selected data for each data element, the positional information in the abstract data structure being unrelated to the text searched as claimed.

Hence, Consens is missing the same elements as Bradshaw and Shannon. Accordingly, the combination of the cited references does not teach or suggest the elements of the present invention that are included in the language of claim 1 as amended. Similar language is also included in independent claims 20, 31, and 32. Accordingly, the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 20, 31, and 32 and their corresponding dependent claims is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 4, 16-19, 22 and 27-30

Claims 4, 16-19, 22 and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw, in view of Shannon, in view of Consens, and further in view of Brandt (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,905, hereinafter "Brandt") filed December 23, 1996. Claims 4 and 16-19 are dependent on claim 1. Therefore, claims 4 and 16-19 include the same elements as claims 1. Claims 22 and 27-30 are dependent on claim 20. Therefore, claims 22 and 27-30 include the same elements as claims 20. As noted above, the combination of Bradshaw, Shannon, and Consens do not teach or suggest the elements recited in claims 1 and 20. These features are also missing from Brandt. Brandt provides a common user interface for a software application accessed via the Internet. A software application runs on a web server computer system. However, Brandt does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 1. Thus, claims 4, 16-19, 22 and 27-30 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above with respect to claims 1 and 20.

Claims 5 and 23

Claims 5 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw, in view of Shannon, further in view of Consens further in view of Brandt, and further in view of Dascalu (US Patent No. 5,958,015) filed October 29, 1996. Claim 5 is dependent on claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1. Therefore, claim 5 includes the same elements as claim 1. Claim 23 is dependent on claim 20. Therefore, claim 23 includes the same elements as claim 20. As noted above, the combination of Bradshaw, Shannon, Consens, and Brandt does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claims 1 and 20. These features are also missing from Dascalu. Dascalu teaches a session wall that listens to communications sent over the network. Dascalu listens to communication messages exchanged between a client and a server and determines whether the messages can be permitted based on stored access rules. However,

Dascalu does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claims 1 and 20. Thus, claims 5 and 23 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above with respect to claims 1 and 20.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: _7-12-2010_

Marina Portnova
Reg. No. 45,750

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300